

Appln No.: 10/605,498
Amendment Dated: January 29, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 30, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed November 30, 2005 for the above-captioned application. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Ex Parte Quayle Action that Examiner states


Upon a telephone interview with applicant's representative, Marina Larson, on 11/14/2005, the amendments to the claims filed 10/26/2005 have been entered. The subject matter of claim 14 that is not drawn to the elected invention, SEQ ID NO: 82, has been withdrawn.

To the extent that this statement implies agreement by Applicants' representative to the withdrawal of sequences other than SEQ ID NO 82, it is incorrect. No agreement to such a withdrawal was discussed or given. In the Advisory Action mailed November 10, 2005, the Examiner refused entry of the amendment because it added claims to non-elected sequences that "would be subject to restriction." In the telephone interview, it was noted that generic claims encompassing all of these sequences had been previously presented and examined.

Applicants have amended claim 14 to correct the typographical error, and claims 16 and 17 to provide correct dependency.

A petition under Rule 1.144 is filed herewith requesting review of the restriction requirement.

Respectfully submitted,



Marina T. Larson, Ph.D
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32038

(970) 468 6600